UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/748,852	12/31/2003	Oliver O. Stanchfield	8688.024.US0000	2816
	7590 07/18/200 CE + QUIGG L.L.P.	EXAMINER		
1300 Eye Street	t, N.W.	PLUMMER, ELIZABETH A		
1000 West Tower Washington, DC 20005			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
_			3635	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			07/18/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/748,852	STANCHFIELD, OLIVER O.		
Examiner	Art Unit		
ELIZABETH A. PLUMMER	3635		

	ELIZABETTI A. FLOIVIIVIER	3633						
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence add	ress					
THE REPLY FILED <u>26 June 2008</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APF	PLICATION IN CONDITION FOR A	LLOWANCE.						
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Application (RCE) in compliance with 37 Comperiods:	replies: (1) an amendment, affidavi eal (with appeal fee) in compliance	t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request					
a) The period for reply expires <u>3</u> months from the mailing date	of the final rejection.							
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la	ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing	g date of the final rejection	n.					
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07( Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CER 1.136(a). The date	f).							
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed,								
may reduce any earned patent term adjustment.  See 37 CFR 1.704(b) NOTICE OF APPEAL		• ,	•					
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed we	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the						
AMENDMENTS	itilit the time period set forth in 37	Of 10 41.57 (a).						
3. 🔯 The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection,	but prior to the date of filing a brief.	will not be entered be	cause					
(a) They raise new issues that would require further co								
(b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belo	**							
(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in bet appeal; and/or	ter form for appeal by materially red	ducing or simplifying tl	ne issues for					
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a	corresponding number of finally reje	ected claims.						
NOTE: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> . (See 37 CFR 1.1	16 and 41.33(a)).							
4. $oxedsymbol{oxed}$ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.13	21. See attached Notice of Non-Co	mpliant Amendment (I	PTOL-324).					
5. $\ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \$								
<ol> <li>Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be al non-allowable claim(s).</li> </ol>	·	•	-					
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided the status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		l be entered and an e	xplanation of					
Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to:								
Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-5, 7,8, 10-16, and 20-33</u> . Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:								
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE								
8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bu because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).								
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary</li> </ol>	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	al and/or appellant fail:	s to provide a					
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanatio REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER</li> </ol>	n of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attach	ed.					
11.  The request for reconsideration has been considered bu See Continuation Sheet.	t does NOT place the application in	condition for allowan	ce because:					
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s).	(PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)							
13.  Other:	, , , , , , , <u></u>							
	/Jeanette E Chapman/ Primary Examiner, Art U	nit 3633						

Continuation of 3. NOTE: While the new claim 4 is not a new limitation, the claims depending from claim 4 present a new combination of limitations and a different scope than the prior claims..

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The arguments are not found persuasive. Regarding applicants argument that there are not a plurality of decorative faces, both sides can each be provided with a different decorative pattern (page 3, paragraph 32), and at least one of them has an overly of décor paper (page 2, paragraph 31). Regarding applicants arguments that Pamplin inherently discloses a method of reducing inventories, the rejection as previously stated reads that Ford inherently teaches a method of reducing inventories (page 1, lines 1-20) and is then modified in view of Pamplin. Applicant appears to be doing a piecemeal analysis rather than addressing the combined rejection of Ford in view of Pamplin. Regarding applicants arguments that disclose a plurality of faces that differ in shape, the two distinct faces are refered separately (face 9, face 10) and as shown in Fig. 2 and Fig. 4, the faces create two different shapes..